arXiv:1209.3096v1 [math.AP] 14 Sep 2012

The Defocusing Energy-Critical Wave Equation with a Cubic Convolution

Changxing Miao[1], Junyong Zhang[2] Jiqiang Zheng[1,3]
[1] Institute of Applied Physics and Computational Mathematics
P. O. Box 8009, Beijing, China, 100088;
[2] Department of Mathematics, Beijing Institute of Technology, Beijing 100081
[3] The Graduate School of China Academy of Engineering Physics
P. O. Box 2101, Beijing, China, 100088 ;
(miao_changxing@iapcm.ac.cn; zhangjunyong111@sohu.com; zhengjiqiang@gmail.com)

Abstract

In this paper, we study the theory of the global well-posedness and scattering for the energy-critical wave equation with a cubic convolution nonlinearity $u_{tt}-\Delta u+(|x|^{-4}*|u|^2)u=0$ in spatial dimension $d\geqslant 5$. The main difficulties are the absence of the classical finite speed of propagation (i.e. the monotonic local energy estimate on the light cone), which is a fundamental property to exclude the finite time blowup solutions and then to obtain scattering for the wave equations with the local nonlinearity $f(u)=|u|^{2^*-2}u$. To compensate it, we resort to the extended causality and utilize the strategy derived from concentration compactness ideas. The proof of the global well-posedness and scattering is reduced to show the nonexistence of the three enemies: finite time blowup; soliton-like solution; low-to-high cascade. We will utilize the Morawetz estimate, the extended causality and the low bound of $\|u\|_{L_x^{2^*}}$ to preclude the last two enemies. Finally, we adopt the method of partition timespace norm by time interval in Tao[35] and the inverse Sobolev inequality to kill the finite time blowup solutions.

Key Words: wave-Hartree equation, Concentration compactness, Morawetz estimate, Scattering.
AMS Classification: Primary 35P25. Secondary 35B40, 35Q40, 81U99.

1 Introduction

This paper is devoted to study the global well-posedness and scattering for the defocusing energy-critical wave equation with a cubic convolution

$$\begin{cases}\ddot{u}-\Delta u+f(u)=0, \quad (t,x)\in\mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{R}^d, \quad d\geqslant 5\\ (u(0),\dot{u}(0))=(u_0(x),u_1(x))\in\dot{H}^1(\mathbb{R}^d)\times L^2(\mathbb{R}^d),\end{cases}\tag{1.1}$$

where $u(t,x)$ is a complex-valued function in spacetime $\mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{R}^d$, $f(u)=\big(V(\cdot)*|u|^2\big)u$ with $V(x)=|x|^{-4}$, the dot denotes the time derivative and $*$ stands for the convolution in $\mathbb{R}^d$.

The terminology "Energy-critical" is due to the fact that both the Energy $E(u,\dot u)$ defined by

$$E(u,\dot u):=\frac{1}{2}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\Big(|\nabla u(x)|^2+|\dot u(x)|^2\Big)dx+\frac{1}{4}\iint_{\mathbb{R}^d\times\mathbb{R}^d}\frac{|u(y)|^2|u(x)|^2}{|x-y|^4}dxdy \tag{1.2}$$

and the equation itself are invariant under the rescaling symmetry

$$u(t,x)\mapsto\lambda^{\frac{d}{2}-1}u(\lambda t,\lambda x), \tag{1.3}$$

for $\lambda>0$. Note that the Energy is conserved by the flow (1.1), hence we do not specify time in the notation.

On one hand, the scattering theory for the energy critical wave equation

$$\ddot u-\Delta u+\mu|u|^{2^*-2}u=0,\ 2^*=\frac{2d}{d-2}, \tag{1.4}$$

has been intensively studied in [1, 8, 9, 11, 32, 35]. When $\mu=1$, which corresponds to the defocusing case, the theory of the global well-posedness and scattering has been studied by Grillakis [8], Kapitanski [9], Shatah-Struwe[32], Bahouri-Gérard [1], Tao [35] and the references cited therein. In particular, Tao in [35] derived a exponential type spacetime bound. The analogs for 3D quintic Schrödinger equation have been established by Colliander, Keel, Staffilani, Takaoka, and Tao [5] recently. For the focusing case: $\mu=-1$, and $3\leqslant d\leqslant 5$, recently Kenig and Merle [11] employed sophisticated "concentrated compactness + rigidity method" to obtain the dichotomy-type result under the assumption that $E(u_0,u_1)<E(W,0)$, where W denotes the ground state of the elliptic equation

$$\Delta W+|W|^{\frac{2d}{d-2}}W=0.$$

Thereafter, [4] extend the above result in [11] to higher dimensions.

On the other hand, the scattering theory for the Hartree equation

$$i\dot u=-\Delta u+\mu(|x|^{-\gamma}*|u|^2)u$$

has been also studied by many authors (see [7, 16, 21, 22, 23, 25]). For the subcritical cases in the defocusing case (i.e. $2\leqslant\gamma<\min\{4,d\}$ and $\mu=1$) , Ginibre and Velo [7] derived the associated Morawetz inequality and extracted an useful Birman-Solomjak type estimate to obtain the asymptotic completeness in the energy space. Nakanishi [29] improved the results by a new Morawetz estimate. For the critical case ($\gamma=4,\ d\geqslant 5$), Miao, Xu and Zhao [21] took advantage of a new kind of the localized Morawetz estimate to rule out the possibility of the energy concentration at origin and established the scattering results in the energy space for the radial data in dimension $d\geqslant 5$. We refer also to [22, 23, 25, 24] for the general data.

For the equation (1.1) with $V(x) = |x|^{-\gamma}$, $2 \leqslant \gamma < \min\{d, 4\}$ and $d \geqslant 3$, using the ideas of Strauss [33], [34] and Pecher [31], Mochizuki [27] showed that if $d \geqslant 3$, $2 \leqslant \gamma < \min(d, 4)$, then the global well-posedness and scattering results with small data hold in the energy space $H^1 \times L^2$. One may also refer to [26] which study a complete scattering theory of the Klein-Gordon equation with a cubic convolution for large data in the subcritical case. This paper is devoted to study a complete scattering theory of the equation (1.1) for the critical case (i.e. $\gamma = 4,\ d \geqslant 5$) in the energy space $\dot{H}^1_x(\mathbb{R}^d) \times L^2_x(\mathbb{R}^d)$.

Before stating the main results, we introduce some background materials.

Definition 1.1. *(solution) A function $u:\ I \times \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}$ on a nonempty time interval $0 \in I$ is a strong solution to (1.1) if $(u, u_t) \in C^0_t(J; \dot{H}^1 \times L^2)$ and $u \in X_1(J)$ (defined in (2.7) below.) for any compact $J \subset I$ and for each $t \in I$, it obeys the Duhamel's formula:*

$$\begin{pmatrix} u(t) \\ \dot{u}(t) \end{pmatrix} = V_0(t) \begin{pmatrix} u_0(x) \\ u_1(x) \end{pmatrix} - \int_0^t V_0(t-s) \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ f(u(s)) \end{pmatrix} ds, \tag{1.5}$$

where

$$V_0(t) = \begin{pmatrix} \dot{K}(t), K(t) \\ \ddot{K}(t), \dot{K}(t) \end{pmatrix}, \quad K(t) = \frac{\sin(t\omega)}{\omega}, \quad \omega = \big(-\Delta\big)^{1/2}.$$

We refer to the interval I as the lifespan of u. We say that u is a maximal-lifespan solution if the solution cannot be extended to any strictly large interval. We say that u is a global solution if $I = \mathbb{R}$.

The solution lies in the space X_1 locally in time is natural since by Strichartz estimate, the linear flow always lies in this space. Also, the finiteness of the norm on maximal-lifespan implies the solution is global and scatters in both time directions. In view of this, we define

$$S_I(u) = \|u\|_{X_1(I)} \tag{1.6}$$

as the scattering size of u. Closely associated with the notion of scattering is the notion of blowup:

Definition 1.2. *(Blowup) We call that a maximal-lifespan solution $u : I \times \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}$ blows up forward in time if there exists a time $t_0 \in I$ such that $S_{[t_0, \sup I)} = \infty$; similarly, $u(t, x)$ blows up backward in time if $S_{(inf\ I, t_0]} = \infty$.*

Our main result is the following global well-posedness and scattering result in the energy space.

Theorem 1.1. *Let $d \geqslant 5$ and $(u_0, u_1) \in \dot{H}^1(\mathbb{R}^d) \times L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ be initial data with energy bound*

$$E(u_0, u_1) \leqslant E \tag{1.7}$$

for any constant $E > 0$. Then there exists a unique global solution $u(t)$ of (1.1) which scatters in the sense that there exists solution $v_\pm$ of the free wave equation

$$\ddot{v} - \Delta v = 0 \tag{1.8}$$

with $(v_\pm(0),\dot v_\pm(0))\in \dot H^1\times L^2$ *such that*

$$\big\|\big(u(t),\dot u(t)\big)-\big(v_\pm(t),\dot v_\pm(t)\big)\big\|_{\dot H^1_x\times L^2_x}\longrightarrow 0,\quad \textit{as}\quad t\longrightarrow\pm\infty. \tag{1.9}$$

1.1 Outline of the proof of Theorem 1.1

As we know, there is no pointwise criteria for the critical problem, GWP and scattering result are simultaneously solved in general. However, the study history of the $\dot H^1$-critical wave equation shows us scattering result is later than global well-posedness.

Now, we recall the history of the $\dot H^1$-critical wave equation (1.4) with $\mu=1$. In [8, 9, 32], by the finite propagation speed of wave equation, they considered the Cauchy problem with compact data. And without loss of generality, one can assume the solution is smooth. They showed the existence of the global smooth solution by ruling out the accumulation of the energy at any time, where they utilized the classical finite speed of propagation (i.e. the monotonic local energy estimate on the light cone)

$$\int_{|x|\leqslant R-t} e(t,x)dx\leqslant\int_{|x|\leqslant R} e(0,x)dx,\quad t>0 \tag{1.10}$$

where

$$e(t,x):=\frac12|\dot u|^2+\frac12|\nabla u|^2+\frac{1}{2^*}|u|^{2^*}, \tag{1.11}$$

which is a fundamental property for the wave equations with local nonlinearities. By compactness argument, one can show the global existence and uniqueness of the energy solution. While the scattering result of the energy solution was solved ten years later [1]. It also depends heavily on the monotonic local energy estimate on the light cone.

However, the wave-Hartree lacks the classical finite speed of propagation. The nonlocal property of Hartree term cause the essential difficulties for nonlinear pointwise estimates, this defeats our attempts to establish the same classical finite speed of propagation as above. As a substitute, one may resort to the causality (Theorem 3 in Menzala-Strauss [19]), however it holds only for the case $V\in L^{d/3}+L^\infty$, which does not contain the critical cases, the exponent $d/3$ stems from the estimate of the term $\int u_t u(V*u^2)dx$ as we know that the term cannot be controlled by the energy if $V\in L^p$ when $p<\frac d3$. To overcome it, we make use of the finite speed of propagation of the free operators $K(t)$ and $\dot K(t)$ and the boundness of the local-in-time Strichartz estimate of the solution (the nonlinear interaction is actually the linear feedback), to establish the causality for critical cases $V\in L^{\frac d4-}+L^\infty$. See the detail in Subsection 2.3.

Since the wave-Hartree lacks the classical finite speed of propagation, we will not utilize the classical method in proving the GWP first and then scattering for the wave equation with local nonlinearity. While, inspired by the strategy derived from concentration compactness ideas, we will show GWP and scattering result simultaneously. We remark that the method here also works for the local nonlinearity $f(u)=|u|^{2^*-2}u$.

Other than the classical finite speed of propagation, it is also not easy to verify that the Hartree nonlinearity satisfies some positive properties, e.g. $G(u)\geqslant 0$ $(G(u)=$

$f(u)\bar{u} - 2\int_0^{|u|} f(r)dr$), and it took an important role in establishing some Morawetz-type estimates in [28]. We overcome this difficulty by using the symmetry property of $V(x)$ and also establish Morawetz-type estimate by borrowing some strategies from [30].

In addition, the Cauchy problem for the nonlinear wave equation relies on two independent initial data. In the subsequent contradiction argument in the proof of the lower bound on $L_x^{2^*}$ norm, the smallness of the initial position function on $L_x^{2^*}$ norm can not supply any information of initial velocity, thus it seems to be difficult to obtain the result that the concentration time must be far away from initial time without the smallness of initial velocity. However, we can still get the lower bound on potential energy by exploiting sufficiently the smallness of initial perturbation term.

Outline of the proof: For each energy $E > 0$, let us define $\Lambda(E)$ to be the quantity

$$\Lambda(E) = \sup\{\|u\|_{X_1(I)};\ E(u, u_t) \leqslant E\}$$

where u ranges over all solutions to (1.1) on the spacetime slab $I \times \mathbb{R}^d$ of energy less than E and

$$E_{crit} = \sup\{E:\ \Lambda(E) < +\infty\}.$$

Our goal in the following is to prove that $E_{crit} = +\infty$. We argue by contradiction. If $E_{crit} < +\infty$, then we will see that the failure of Theorem 1.1 is caused by a special class of solutions; on the other hand, these solutions have so many good properties that they do not exist. Thus we get a contradiction. While we will make some further reductions later, the main property of the special counterexamples is almost periodicity modulo symmetries:

Definition 1.3. *Let $d \geqslant 5$, a solution u to* (1.1) *with lifespan I is called almost periodic modulo symmetries if (u, u_t) is bounded in $\dot{H}_x^1 \times L_x^2$ and there exist functions $N(t):\ I \to \mathbb{R}^+,\ x(t):\ I \to \mathbb{R}^d$ and $C(\eta): \mathbb{R}^+ \to \mathbb{R}^+$ such that for all $t \in I$ and $\eta > 0$,*

$$\int_{|x-x(t)|\geqslant \frac{C(\eta)}{N(t)}} \big[|\nabla u(t,x)|^2 + |u_t(t,x)|^2\big]dx \leqslant \eta \tag{1.12}$$

and

$$\int_{|\xi|\geqslant C(\eta)N(t)} \big[|\xi|^2|\hat{u}(t,\xi)|^2 + |\hat{u}_t(t,\xi)|^2\big]d\xi \leqslant \eta. \tag{1.13}$$

We refer to the function $N(t)$ as the frequency scale function for the solution u, to $x(t)$ as the spatial center function, and to $C(\eta)$ as the compactness modules function.

Remark 1.1. *By Ascoli-Arzela Theorem, u is almost periodic modulo symmetry if and only if the set*

$$\Big\{\big(N(t)^{-\frac{d-2}{2}}u,\ N(t)^{-\frac{d}{2}}u\big)\big(t, x(t) + \frac{x}{N(t)}\big),\ t \in I\Big\}$$

falls in a compact set in $\dot{H}_x^1 \times L_x^2$. The following are consequences of this statement. If u is almost periodic modulo symmetry, then

$$\int_{|x-x(t)|\geqslant \frac{C(\eta)}{N(t)}} |u(t,x)|^{\frac{2d}{d-2}}dx \leqslant \eta. \tag{1.14}$$

And there exists $c(\eta) > 0$ *such that*

$$\int_{|x-x(t)|\leqslant \frac{c(\eta)}{N(t)}} \big[|\nabla u(t,x)|^2 + |u_t(t,x)|^2\big]dx \leqslant \eta \tag{1.15}$$

and

$$\int_{|\xi|\leqslant c(\eta)N(t)} \big[|\xi|^2|\hat{u}(t,\xi)|^2 + |\hat{u}_t(t,\xi)|^2\big]d\xi \leqslant \eta. \tag{1.16}$$

We are now ready to state the first major milestone in the proof of Theorem 1.1.

Theorem 1.2. *(Reduction to almost periodic solutions, [11, 12]) Assume* $E_{crit} < \infty$. *Then there exists a maximal-lifespan solution* $u: \ I \times \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}$ *to* (1.1) *such that*

1. *u is almost periodic modulo symmetries;*
2. *u blows up both forward and backward in time;*
3. *u has the minimal kinetic energy among all blowup solutions. More precisely, let* $v: \ J \times \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}$ *be a maximal-lifespan solution which blows up in at least one time direction, then*

$$\sup_{t\in I}\big\|\big(u(t),u_t(t)\big)\big\|_{\dot{H}^1_x\times L^2_x} \leqslant \sup_{t\in J}\big\|\big(v(t),v_t(t)\big)\big\|_{\dot{H}^1_x\times L^2_x}.$$

The reduction to almost periodic solutions is now a standard technique in the analysis of dispersive equations at critical regularity. Their existence was first proved in the pioneering work by Karaani [13] for the mass-critical NLS. Kenig and Merle [10] adapted the argument to the energy-critical NLS, and first applied this to study the wellposedness problem.

So far, we do not have any control on the frequency scale function $N(t)$. However, the following theorem shows that no matter how small the set of minimal energy blowup solution is, we will inevitably encounter at least one of the following three enemies. Thus the proof of Theorem 1.1 is reduced to showing the nonexistence of the three enemies.

Theorem 1.3. *(Three enemies, [14, 24]). Suppose* $d \geqslant 5$ *is such that Theorem 1.1 fails, that is,* $E_{crit} < \infty$. *Then there exists a maximal-lifespan solution* $u: \ I\times\mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}$, *which is almost periodic modulo symmetries, and* $S_I(u) = \infty$. *Moreover, we can also ensure that the lifespan* I *and the frequency scale function* $N(t): \ I \to \mathbb{R}^+$ *match one of the following three scenarios:*

1. *(Finite time blowup)* $|inf\, I| < \infty$, *or* $sup\, I < \infty$.
2. *(Soliton-like solution)* $I = \mathbb{R}$ *and* $N(t) = 1$ *for all* $t \in \mathbb{R}$.
3. *(Low-to-high cascade)* $I = \mathbb{R}$ *and*

$$\inf_{t\in\mathbb{R}} N(t) \geqslant 1, \ \textit{and} \ \overline{\lim_{t\to\infty}} N(t) = \infty.$$

The reference given above discusses the energy-critical NLS; however, the result follows from Theorem 1.2 by the same arguments since they are essentially combinatorial and so apply to any dispersive equation, such as wave equation [15].

We use the Morawetz estimate and an essential property that $\|u(t)\|_{L_x^{2^*}}$ bounded from below for the almost periodic modulus symmetries solution to kill the last two enemies in Section 5. The finite-time blow-up solution is precluded in Section 6, where we adopt the method of partition timespace norm by time interval in Tao [35] and the inverse Sobolev inequality to get a contradiction.

1.2 Notations

Finally, we conclude the introduction by giving some notations which will be used throughout this paper. To simplify the expression of our inequalities, we introduce some symbols $\lesssim, \sim, \ll$. If X, Y are nonnegative quantities, we use $X \lesssim Y$ or $X = O(Y)$ to denote the estimate $X \leqslant CY$ for some C which may depend on the critical energy E_{crit} (see below) but not on any parameter such as η and ρ, and $X \sim Y$ to denote the estimate $X \lesssim Y \lesssim X$. We use $X \ll Y$ to mean $X \leqslant cY$ for some small constant c which is again allowed to depend on E_{crit}. We will sometimes write $a-$ to denote $a-\eta$ for arbitrarily small $\eta > 0$. We use $C \gg 1$ to denote various large finite constants, and $0 < c \ll 1$ to denote various small constants. For any $r, 1 \leqslant r \leqslant \infty$, we denote by $\|\cdot\|_r$ the norm in $L^r = L^r(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and by r' the conjugate exponent defined by $\frac{1}{r} + \frac{1}{r'} = 1$.

The Fourier transform on $\mathbb{R}^d$ is defined by

$$\widehat{f}(\xi) := \big(2\pi\big)^{-\frac{d}{2}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} e^{-ix\cdot\xi} f(x)dx,$$

giving rise to the fractional differentiation operators $|\nabla|^s$ and $\langle\nabla\rangle^s$, defined by

$$\widehat{|\nabla|^s f}(\xi) := |\xi|^s \hat{f}(\xi), \quad \widehat{\langle\nabla\rangle^s f}(\xi) := \langle\xi\rangle^s \hat{f}(\xi),$$

where $\langle\xi\rangle := 1 + |\xi|$. This helps us to define the homogeneous and inhomogeneous Sobolev norms

$$\big\|f\big\|_{\dot{H}^s} := \big\||\xi|^s \hat{f}\big\|_{L^2}, \quad \big\|f\big\|_{H^s} := \big\|\langle\xi\rangle^s \hat{f}\big\|_{L^2}.$$

We will also need the Littlewood-Paley projection operators. Specifically, let $\varphi(\xi)$ be a smooth bump function adapted to the ball $|\xi| \leqslant 2$ which equals 1 on the ball $|\xi| \leqslant 1$. For each dyadic number $N \in 2^{\mathbb{Z}}$, we define the Littlewood-Paley operators

$$\begin{aligned}
\widehat{P_{\leqslant N} f}(\xi) &:= \varphi\Big(\frac{\xi}{N}\Big)\widehat{f}(\xi),\\
\widehat{P_{>N} f}(\xi) &:= \Big(1 - \varphi\Big(\frac{\xi}{N}\Big)\Big)\widehat{f}(\xi),\\
\widehat{P_N f}(\xi) &:= \Big(\varphi\Big(\frac{\xi}{N}\Big) - \varphi\Big(\frac{2\xi}{N}\Big)\Big)\widehat{f}(\xi).
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly we can define $P_{<N}$, $P_{\geqslant N}$, and $P_{M<\cdot\leqslant N} = P_{\leqslant N} - P_{\leqslant M}$, whenever M and N are dyadic numbers. We will frequently write $f_{\leqslant N}$ for $P_{\leqslant N} f$ and similarly for the other operators. For $s \in \mathbb{R}, 1 \leqslant r \leqslant \infty$, the homogeneous Besov space $\dot{B}^s_{r,2}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is defined by

$$\dot{B}^s_{r,2}(\mathbb{R}^d) = \Big\{ u \in \mathcal{S}'_h(\mathbb{R}^d), \big\| 2^{js} \| P_{2^j} u \|_{L^r} \big\|^2_{l^2_{j\in\mathbb{Z}}} < \infty \Big\}.$$

For details of Besov space, we refer to [2].

The Littlewood-Paley operators commute with derivative operators, the free propagator, and the conjugation operation. They are self-adjoint and bounded on every L^p_x and $\dot{H}^s_x$ space for $1 \leqslant p \leqslant \infty$ and $s \geqslant 0$, moreover, they also obey the following Bernstein estimates

$$\begin{aligned}
\big\| P_{\geqslant N} f \big\|_{L^p} &\lesssim N^{-s} \big\| |\nabla|^s P_{\geqslant N} f \big\|_{L^p}, \\
\big\| |\nabla|^s P_{\leqslant N} f \big\|_{L^p} &\lesssim N^{s} \big\| P_{\leqslant N} f \big\|_{L^p}, \\
\big\| |\nabla|^{\pm s} P_{N} f \big\|_{L^p} &\sim N^{\pm s} \big\| P_{N} f \big\|_{L^p}, \\
\big\| P_{\leqslant N} f \big\|_{L^q} &\lesssim N^{\frac{d}{p}-\frac{d}{q}} \big\| P_{\leqslant N} f \big\|_{L^p}, \\
\big\| P_{N} f \big\|_{L^q} &\lesssim N^{\frac{d}{p}-\frac{d}{q}} \big\| P_{N} f \big\|_{L^p},
\end{aligned}$$

where $s \geqslant 0$ and $1 \leqslant p \leqslant q \leqslant \infty$.

2 Preliminaries

2.1 The Strichartz estimates

In this section, we consider the Cauchy problem for the equation (1.1)

$$\begin{cases} \ddot{u} - \Delta u + f(u) = 0, \\ u(0) = u_0, \ \dot{u}(0) = u_1. \end{cases} \tag{2.1}$$

The integral equation for the Cauchy problem (2.1) can be written as

$$u(t) = \dot{K}(t) u_0 + K(t) u_1 - \int_0^t K(t-s) f(u(s)) ds, \tag{2.2}$$

or

$$\begin{pmatrix} u(t) \\ \dot{u}(t) \end{pmatrix} = V_0(t) \begin{pmatrix} u_0(x) \\ u_1(x) \end{pmatrix} - \int_0^t V_0(t-s) \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ f(u(s)) \end{pmatrix} ds, \tag{2.3}$$

where

$$V_0(t) = \begin{pmatrix} \dot{K}(t), K(t) \\ \ddot{K}(t), \dot{K}(t) \end{pmatrix}, \quad K(t) = \frac{\sin(t\omega)}{\omega}, \quad \omega = \big(-\Delta \big)^{1/2}.$$

Now we recall the following Strichartz estimates.

Lemma 2.1. *(Strichartz estimates,[6, 18, 20]) Let u be the strong solution of* (2.1)*. Assume $(q,r), (q_1, r_1) \in \tilde{\Lambda}$, and*

$$\tilde{\Lambda} = \{ (q,r) : \frac{2}{q} \leqslant (d-1)(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{r}), (q,r,d) \neq (2,\infty,3), 2 \leqslant q, r \leqslant \infty \}.$$

Then, we have the following Strichartz estimates

$$\|u\|_{L^q(I;\dot{B}^{\sigma}_{r,2})} \lesssim \|u_0\|_{\dot{H}^{s_1+\sigma}} + \|u_1\|_{\dot{H}^{s_1+\sigma-1}} + \|F\|_{L^{q_1'}(I;\dot{B}^{\sigma+s_2-1}_{r_1',2})}, \tag{2.4}$$

where

$$\begin{cases} s_1 = \delta(r) - \frac{1}{q}, \\ s_2 = s_1 + \delta(r_1) - \frac{1}{q_1}, \end{cases} \tag{2.5}$$

with $\delta(r) = d(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{r})$. *Especially,*

$$\|u\|_{L^{q_1}(I;\dot{B}^{1-s_1}_{r_1,2})} \lesssim \|u_0\|_{\dot{H}^1} + \|u_1\|_{L^2} + \|F\|_{L^{q_2'}(I;\dot{B}^{s_2}_{r_2',2})}, \tag{2.6}$$

here $s_i = \delta(r_i) - \frac{1}{q_i},\ i = 1, 2$.

It is useful to define several spaces and give estimates of the nonlinearities in terms of these spaces. For any time interval $I \subset \mathbb{R}$, define

$$X_j(I) := \begin{cases} L^{q_j}(I; \dot{B}^{\sigma_j}_{r_j,2}(\mathbb{R}^d)), & j = 0, 2, 3; \\ L^{q_j}(I; L^{r_j}(\mathbb{R}^d)), & j = 1. \end{cases} \tag{2.7}$$

Now we set the values of (q_j, r_j, σ_j). Denote $\chi_j = (\frac{1}{q_j}, \frac{1}{r_j}, \sigma_j)$. Let

$$\begin{aligned} q_0 &:= \frac{4d-6}{d-1}, \quad r_0 := 2^* := \frac{2d}{d-2}, \quad q_3 := \frac{2d}{d-1}; \\ \chi_0 &:= \Big(\frac{1}{q_0}, \frac{1}{r_0}, \frac{1}{q_0}\Big), \qquad \chi_1 := \Big(\frac{1}{q_0}, \frac{1}{r_0} - \frac{1}{q_0 d}, 0\Big), \\ \chi_2 &:= \Big(\frac{3}{q_0}, \frac{d+2}{2d} - \frac{2}{dq_0}, \frac{1}{q_0}\Big), \ \chi_3 := \Big(\frac{1}{q_3}, \frac{1}{r_0}, \frac{1}{q_3}\Big). \end{aligned}$$

It is easy to verify that the Sobolev embedding relations

$$X_0(I) \hookrightarrow X_1(I).$$

There are two important numbers associated with χ_j

$$\mu_j := d\big(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{r_j}\big) + \sigma_j - \frac{1}{q_j}, \tag{2.8}$$

$$\nu_j := \frac{1}{q_j} - \frac{d-1}{2}\big(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{r_j}\big). \tag{2.9}$$

It is easy to verify that

$$\mu_0 = \mu_1 = \mu_3 = 1,\ \mu_2 = -1,\ \nu_1 < \nu_0 < 0 = \nu_3,\ \nu_2 \geqslant 1.$$

Now we define the $\dot{H}^{\mu}$-Strichartz space $Y^{\mu}(I)$

$$Y^{\mu}(I) := \bigcap_{(q,r,\sigma)\in\Lambda} L^q(I;\dot{B}^{\sigma}_{r,2}(\mathbb{R}^d))$$

equipped with $\dot{H}^{\mu}$-Strichartz space-time norm

$$\|u\|_{Y^{\mu}(I)} := \sup_{(q,r,\sigma)\in\Lambda} \|u\|_{L^q(I;\dot{B}^{\sigma}_{r,2}(\mathbb{R}^d))}, \tag{2.10}$$

where

$$\Lambda = \Big\{(q,r,\sigma) \in [2,\infty)^2 \times \mathbb{R} : \frac{1}{q} = d(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{r}) + \sigma - \mu; \frac{2}{q} \leqslant (d-1)(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{r})\Big\}. \tag{2.11}$$

In this paper, we shall work primarily with $\dot{H}^1$-Strichartz space-time norm. It is easy to see that

$$\|u\|_{L_t^{\infty}(I;\dot{H}_x^1)} + \|u\|_{X_0(I)} \lesssim \|u\|_{Y^1}, \tag{2.12}$$

for any nonlinear solution u on $I \times \mathbb{R}^d$ and the following corollary.

Corollary 2.1. *Let u be the solution of* (2.1). *Then,*

(i) If $(u_0, u_1) \in \dot{H}^1 \times L^2$, then

$$\|u\|_{Y^1([0,T))} + \|\dot{u}\|_{L^{\infty}([0,T);L^2)} \lesssim \|u_0\|_{\dot{H}^1} + \|u_1\|_{L^2} + \|f\|_{X_2([0,T))}. \tag{2.13}$$

(ii) For $f(u) = \big(V * |u|^2\big)u$, we have the following nonlinear estimates

$$\|f\|_{X_2([0,T))} \lesssim \|u\|_{X_0([0,T))}\|u\|^2_{X_1([0,T))} \lesssim \|u\|^3_{X_0([0,T))}. \tag{2.14}$$

We can now state the local well-posedness for (1.1) with large initial data and small data scattering in the energy space.

Theorem 2.1 (LWP). *Assume $d \geqslant 5$, $(u_0, u_1) \in \dot{H}^1 \times L^2$, $0 \in I$ an interval and $\|(u_0, u_1)\|_{\dot{H}^1\times L^2} \leqslant A$, then there exists $\delta = \delta(A)$ such that if*

$$\|\dot{K}(t)u_0 + K(t)u_1\|_{X_1(I)} < \delta,$$

there exists an unique solution u to (1.1) *in $I \times \mathbb{R}^d$, with $(u, \dot{u}) \in C(I; \dot{H}^1 \times L^2)$, and*

$$\|u\|_{X_1(I)} \leqslant 2\delta, \quad \|u\|_{Y^1(I)} < \infty. \tag{2.15}$$

In particularly, if $I = \mathbb{R}$, then u scatters.

Finally, we conclude this subsection by recalling the following standard finite time blow-up criterion.

Lemma 2.2. *(Standard finite blow-up criterion) If $T_+(u_0, u_1) < +\infty$, then*

$$\|u\|_{X_1\big(\big[0,T_+(u_0,u_1)\big)\big)} = +\infty.$$

A corresponding result holds for $T_-(u_0, u_1)$.

The proof is similar to the one in Lemma 2.11 of [10].

2.2 Perturbation theory

Closely related to the continuous dependence on the data, an essential tool for concentration compactness arguments is the stability theory. More precisely, given an approximate equation

$$\tilde{u}_{tt} - \Delta\tilde{u} = -f(\tilde{u}) + e \tag{2.16}$$

to (1.1), with e small in a suitable space and $(\tilde{u}_0, \tilde{u}_1)$ is close to (u_0, u_1) in energy space, is it possible to show that solution u to (1.1) stays very close to $\tilde{u}$? Note that the question of continuous dependence on the data corresponds to the case $e = 0$.

The following lemma for the nonlinear wave-Hartree equation is analogs to the nonlinear Schrödinger equation in [5]. For convenience, we state the lemma and sketch its proof.

Lemma 2.3. *(perturbation lemma) Let I be a time interval, and let $\tilde{u}$ be a function on $I \times \mathbb{R}^d$ which is a near-solution to (1.1) in the sense that*

$$\tilde{u}_{tt} - \Delta\tilde{u} = -f(\tilde{u}) + e \tag{2.17}$$

for some function e. Assume that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\tilde{u}\|_{X_1(I)} &\leqslant M, \\ \|\tilde{u}\|_{L_t^\infty(I;\dot{H}_x^1(\mathbb{R}^d))} + \|\partial_t\tilde{u}\|_{L_t^\infty(I;L_x^2(\mathbb{R}^d))} &\leqslant E \end{aligned} \tag{2.18}$$

for some constant $M, E > 0$. Let $t_0 \in I$, and let $(u(t_0), u_t(t_0))$ be close to $(\tilde{u}(t_0), \tilde{u}_t(t_0))$ in the sense that

$$\|(u(t_0) - \tilde{u}(t_0), u_t(t_0) - \tilde{u}_t(t_0))\|_{\dot{H}^1 \times L^2} \leqslant E' \tag{2.19}$$

for some $E' > 0$. Let

$$L(u(t_0) - \tilde{u}(t_0), u_t(t_0) - \tilde{u}_t(t_0)) := \dot{K}(t - t_0)(u(t_0) - \tilde{u}(t_0)) + K(t - t_0)(u_t(t_0) - \tilde{u}_t(t_0)),$$

and assume also that we have smallness conditions

$$\|e\|_{X_2(I)} + \left\|L(u(t_0) - \tilde{u}(t_0), u_t(t_0) - \tilde{u}_t(t_0))\right\|_{X_0(I)} \leqslant \epsilon \tag{2.20}$$

for some small $0 < \epsilon < \epsilon_1$, where $\epsilon_1 = \epsilon_1(M, E, E') > 0$. We conclude that there exists a solution to (1.1) on $I \times \mathbb{R}^d$ with the specified initial data $(u(t_0), u_t(t_0))$ at t_0, and furthermore

$$\begin{aligned} \|u - \tilde{u}\|_{Y^1(I)} &\leqslant C(M, E, E'), \\ \|u\|_{Y^1(I)} &\leqslant C(M, E, E'), \\ \|u - \tilde{u}\|_{X_0(I)} &\leqslant C(M, E, E')\epsilon. \end{aligned} \tag{2.21}$$

Proof. Since $\|\tilde{u}\|_{X_1(I)} \leqslant M$, we may subdivide I into $C(M, \varepsilon_0)$ time intervals I_j such that

$$\|\tilde{u}\|_{X_1(I_j)} \leqslant \epsilon_0 \ll 1, \qquad 1 \leqslant j \leqslant C(M, \epsilon_0).$$

By the Strichartz estimate and standard argument we have

$$\|\tilde{u}\|_{Y^1(I_j)} \leqslant C(E), \qquad 1 \leqslant j \leqslant C(M, \varepsilon_0).$$

Summing up over all the intervals, we obtain that

$$\|\tilde{u}\|_{Y^1(I)} \leqslant C(E, M, E'). \tag{2.22}$$

In particular, we have

$$\|\tilde{u}\|_{X_0(I)} \leqslant C(E, M, E'), \tag{2.23}$$

which implies that there exists a partition of the right half of I at t_0:

$$t_0 < t_1 < \cdots < t_N,\ I_j = (t_j, t_{j+1}),\ I \cap (t_0, \infty) = (t_0, t_N),$$

such that $N \leqslant C(L, \delta)$ and for any $j = 0, 1, \cdots, N-1$, we have

$$\|\tilde{u}\|_{X_0(I_j)} \leqslant \delta \ll 1. \tag{2.24}$$

The estimate on the left half of I at t_0 is analogue, we omit it.

Let

$$\gamma(t) = u(t) - \tilde{u}(t), \tag{2.25}$$

and

$$\begin{pmatrix} \gamma_j(t) \\ \dot{\gamma}_j(t) \end{pmatrix} = V_0(t - t_j) \begin{pmatrix} \gamma(t_j) \\ \gamma_t(t_j) \end{pmatrix},\ 0 \leqslant j \leqslant N-1, \tag{2.26}$$

then γ satisfies the following difference equation

$$\begin{cases} (\partial_{tt} - \Delta)\gamma = & -(V * |\tilde{u}|^2)\gamma - 2\big[V * (\gamma\tilde{u})\big] - 2\big[V * (\gamma\tilde{u})\big]\gamma \\ & -(V * |\gamma|^2)\tilde{u} - (V * |\gamma|^2)\gamma - e \\ \qquad\qquad \triangleq & eq(\gamma) \\ \gamma(t_j) = \gamma_j(t_j), & \gamma_t(t_j) = \dot{\gamma}_j(t_j), \end{cases}$$

which implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \begin{pmatrix} \gamma(t) \\ \gamma_t(t) \end{pmatrix} &= \begin{pmatrix} \gamma_j(t) \\ \dot{\gamma}_j(t) \end{pmatrix} - \int_{t_j}^{t} V_0(t-s) \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ eq(\gamma)(s) \end{pmatrix} ds, \\ \begin{pmatrix} \gamma_{j+1}(t) \\ \dot{\gamma}_{j+1}(t) \end{pmatrix} &= \begin{pmatrix} \gamma_j(t) \\ \dot{\gamma}_j(t) \end{pmatrix} - \int_{t_j}^{t_{j+1}} V_0(t-s) \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ eq(\gamma)(s) \end{pmatrix} ds. \end{aligned}$$

It follows from Lemma 2.1 and (2.14) that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\gamma - \gamma_j\|_{X_0(I_j)} + \|\gamma_{j+1} - \gamma_j\|_{X_0(I)} &\lesssim \sum_{k=1}^{3} \|\gamma\|_{X_0(I_j)}^{k} \|\tilde{u}\|_{X_0(I_j)}^{3-k} + \|e\|_{X_2(I_j)} \\ &\lesssim \sum_{k=1}^{3} \|\gamma\|_{X_0(I_j)}^{k} \|\tilde{u}\|_{X_0(I_j)}^{3-k} + \epsilon. \end{aligned} \tag{2.27}$$

Therefore, assuming that

$$\|\gamma\|_{X_0(I_j)} \leqslant \delta \ll 1, \ \forall \ j = 0, 1, \cdots, N-1, \tag{2.28}$$

then by (2.24) and (2.27), we have

$$\|\gamma\|_{X_0(I_j)} + \|\gamma_{j+1}\|_{X_0(t_{j+1}, t_N)} \leqslant C\|\gamma_j\|_{X_0(t_j, t_N)} + \epsilon, \tag{2.29}$$

for some absolute constant $C > 0$. By (2.20) and iteration on j, we obtain

$$\|\gamma\|_{X_0(I)} \leqslant (2C)^N \epsilon \leqslant \frac{\delta}{2}, \tag{2.30}$$

if we choose ϵ_1 sufficiently small. Hence the assumption (2.28) is justified by continuity in t and induction on j. Then repeating the estimate (2.27) once again, we can get the X_0-norm estimate on γ, which implies the Strichartz estimates on u. □

2.3 The Extended Causality

In this subsection, we show a kind of the finite speed of propagation named as causality to control the spatial center function $x(t)$, which extends the result in Menzala-Strauss [19]. As stated in the introduction, for the wave-Hartree equation, we can not show the monotone local energy estimate on the light cone. And as a substitute, Menzala-Strauss [19] show a kind of the finite speed of propagation named as causality for the case $V \in L^{\frac{d}{3}} + L^\infty$.

In fact, the causality can be improved, this relies on two important observations: one point is that the linear operators $K(t)$ and $\dot{K}(t)$ still enjoy the finite speed of propagation, the other point is that the Hartree term acted by the cut-off function can be viewed as the linear feedback of the cutoff solution in the cut-off Duhamel formulae (see (2.33)) due to the short-time Strichartz-norm boundness of the solution. The former allows the cutoff function to go cross the linear operators $K(t)$ and $\dot{K}(t)$ and act directly on data and nonlinearity, while the latter suggests us to iterate the solution just as the Gronwall inequality not as the bootstrap argument. Based on the above discussions, we can extend the exponent range of the causality to energy critical cases $V \in L^{\frac{d}{4}-} + L^\infty$.

Lemma 2.4 (Extended Causality)**.** *Assume that the data* $(u_0, u_1) \in \dot{H}^1 \times L^2$ *have the compact support, i.e*

$$supp\ u_0,\ supp\ u_1 \subset \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d \ : \ |x| \leqslant R\} \tag{2.31}$$

for some constant $R > 0$ *and* $u(t) \in C([0, T_+(u_0, u_1)), \dot{H}^1) \cap C^1([0, T_+(u_0, u_1)), L^2)$ *is the finite energy solution of the equation* (1.1) *with initial data* (u_0, u_1)*. Then it holds that*

$$u(t, x) = 0, \quad a.e. \ \ x \in \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d \ : \ |x| > R + t\}, \ \forall \ t \in [0, T_+(u_0, u_1)). \tag{2.32}$$

Proof. Let

$$\chi_t(x) = \begin{cases} 1, & |x| > R + t, \\ 0, & |x| \leqslant R + t. \end{cases}$$

From Duhamel's formula (2.2) and the finite speed of propagation for the linear operators $K(t)$ and $\dot{K}(t)$, one has

$$\begin{aligned} \chi_t(x)u(t) &= \chi_t(x)\dot{K}(t)u_0 + \chi_t(x)K(t)u_1 - \chi_t(x)\int_0^t K(t-s)f(u(s))ds \\ &= -\chi_t(x)\int_0^t K(t-s)(|x|^{-4} * |u(s)|^2)\chi_s(x)u(s)ds. \end{aligned} \tag{2.33}$$

For $[0,T] \subset\subset [0, T_+(u_0,u_1))$, by the Strichartz estimate, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\chi_t(x)u(t)\|_{L_t^3([0,T],L_x^{\frac{6d}{3d-8}})} &\lesssim \|(|x|^{-4} * |u|^2)\chi_t(x)u\|_{L_t^1([0,T],L_x^2)} \\ &\lesssim \|u\|^2_{L_t^3([0,T],L_x^{\frac{6d}{3d-8}})} \|\chi_t(x)u\|_{L_t^3([0,T],L_x^{\frac{6d}{3d-8}})}. \end{aligned}$$

For $[0,T] \subset\subset [0, T_+(u_0,u_1))$, we can divide the interval $[0,T]$ into $[0,T] = \cup_{j=1}^J I_j$, such that

$$\|u\|_{L_t^3(I_j,L_x^{\frac{6d}{3d-8}})} \leqslant \eta,$$

where η is a small positive constant. And so

$$\|\chi_t(x)u(t)\|_{L_t^3(I_j,L_x^{\frac{6d}{3d-8}})} \leqslant C\eta\|\chi_t(x)u(t)\|_{L_t^3(I_j,L_x^{\frac{6d}{3d-8}})},$$

thus

$$\|\chi_t(x)u(t)\|_{L_t^3(I_j,L_x^{\frac{6d}{3d-8}})} = 0.$$

Summing up over all the intervals, we obtain that

$$\|\chi_t(x)u(t)\|_{L_t^3([0,T],L_x^{\frac{6d}{3d-8}})} = 0. \tag{2.34}$$

From the Strichartz estimates, we get

$$\|\chi_t(x)u(t)\|_{L_t^\infty([0,T],\dot{H}^1)} \lesssim \|u\|^2_{L_t^3([0,T],L_x^{\frac{6d}{3d-8}})} \|\chi_t(x)u\|_{L_t^3([0,T],L_x^{\frac{6d}{3d-8}})} = 0.$$

This together with (2.34) yields that

$$\chi_t(x)u(t) \equiv 0, \ \ a.e. \ x \in \mathbb{R}^d.$$

Therefore

$$u(t) \equiv 0, \ \ a.e. \ x \in \{x : |x - x_0| > R + |t|\}.$$

□

3 Morawetz-type Estimate

In this section, our task is to establish a useful Morawetz estimate by choosing a suitable multiplier. Noting that the nonlinearity of (1.1) is a convolution term, we need use the quantity $|u_\theta|^2/r + |u|^2/r^3$ to estimate $|u|^{2^*}$ inspired by Nakanishi [30]. Compared with the local nonlinearity, we explore a certain symmetry in nonlinearity to get a positive integral quantity (this helps us to weak the requirement that the integrand is positive) to deal with the nonlocal nonlinearity. The embedding theorem for polar coordinates given in [30] is a bridge connecting the whole space $\mathbb{R}^d$ with spherical surface S^{d-1} in the proof. Indeed, the Morawetz estimate for the nonlinear wave-Hartree equation will be used to preclude the soliton-like solution and low-to-high cascade solution in the sense of Theorem 1.3.

Proposition 3.1 (Morawetz estimate)**.** *Let u be a solution to* (1.1) *on a spacetime slab $I \times \mathbb{R}^d$. then we have*

$$\int_I \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{|u|^{2^*}}{|x|} dxdt \leqslant C(E). \tag{3.1}$$

Proof. Let $\psi = u_r + \frac{(d-1)u}{2|x|}$, then we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{Re}\big\{\big((\partial_{tt} - \Delta)u + (V * |u|^2)u\big)\bar{\psi}\big\} \\ = \; & \mathrm{Re}\partial_t(\dot{u}\bar{\psi}) + \mathrm{Re}\nabla \cdot \big\{ - (\nabla u \bar{\psi}) + \theta \ell(u) + \tfrac{1}{2}|u|^2 \nabla(\tfrac{(d-1)}{2|x|})\big\} \\ & + \tfrac{|u_\theta|^2}{r} + \tfrac{(d-1)(d-3)|u|^2}{4r^3} - \tfrac{1}{2}\theta \cdot \nabla(V * |u|^2)|u|^2, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \ell(u) &= \frac{1}{2}\big(- |\dot{u}|^2 + |\nabla u|^2 + (V * |u|^2)|u|^2\big), \\ r &= |x|, \qquad \theta = \frac{x}{|x|}, \\ u_r &= \theta \cdot \nabla u, \quad u_\theta = \nabla u - \theta u_r. \end{aligned}$$

Integrating the above equality with respect to (t, x) over

$$W = \Big\{(t, x)\Big| \; 0 < a \leqslant t \leqslant b, \; x \in \mathbb{R}^d \Big\},$$

we obtain that

$$\int_W \Big[\frac{|u_\theta|^2}{r} + \frac{(d-1)(d-3)|u|^2}{4r^3} - \frac{1}{2}|u|^2 \frac{x}{|x|} \cdot \nabla(V * |u|^2)\Big] dxdt \leqslant C \Big| \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \dot{u}\bar{\psi} dx \Big|_{t=a}^{t=b} \Big|. \tag{3.2}$$

Since

$$-\Big(\frac{x}{|x|} - \frac{y}{|y|}\Big)\nabla V(x-y) = 4\frac{|x||y| - x \cdot y}{|x-y|^6}\Big(\frac{1}{|x|} + \frac{1}{|y|}\Big) \geqslant 0,$$

we have

$$-\int_a^b \int_{\mathbb{R}^d\times\mathbb{R}^d} \Big(\frac{x}{|x|}-\frac{y}{|y|}\Big)\nabla V(x-y)|u(x)|^2|u(y)|^2 dydxdt \geqslant 0.$$

This implies that

$$-\frac{1}{2}\int_W |u|^2\frac{x}{|x|}\cdot\nabla(V*|u|^2)dxdt \geqslant 0. \tag{3.3}$$

Substituting (3.3) into (3.2) and making use of the Hardy inequality, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}\int_W \Big[\frac{|u_\theta|^2}{r}+\frac{(d-1)(d-3)|u|^2}{4r^3}\Big]dxdt &\leqslant C\Big|\int_{\mathbb{R}^n}\dot{u}\bar{\psi}dx\Big|_{t=a}^{t=b}\Big| \\ &\leqslant C(\|\dot{u}\|_2^2+\|\nabla u\|_2^2) \\ &\leqslant CE.\end{aligned} \tag{3.4}$$

On the other hand, we have

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\frac{|u|^{2^*}}{r}dx = \int_0^\infty r^{-1}\int_{S^{d-1}}|u(r\theta)|^{2^*}d\theta r^{d-1}dr = \int_0^\infty r^{d-2}\|u\|^{2^*}_{L^{2^*}_\theta(S^{d-1})}dr. \tag{3.5}$$

Note that the following interpolation and the Sobolev embedding

$$[H^1(S^{d-1}),L^\beta(S^{d-1})]_{\frac{2}{d}} = H^\sigma_q(S^{d-1}) \hookrightarrow L^{2^*}(S^{d-1}), \tag{3.6}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}\beta &= \frac{2(d-1)}{d-2}, \quad \sigma=\frac{d-2}{d}, \\ \frac{1}{q} &= \frac{\sigma}{d-1}+\frac{1}{2^*} = (1-\frac{2}{d})\frac{1}{2}+\frac{2}{d\beta},\end{aligned}$$

it follows that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\frac{|u|^{2^*}}{r}dx \leqslant \int_0^\infty r^{d-2}\|u\|^2_{H^1_\theta(S^{d-1})}\|u\|^{\frac{4}{d-2}}_{L^\beta_\theta(S^{d-1})}dr. \tag{3.7}$$

We need the following Sobolev embedding for the polar coordinates given by Proposition 3.7 in [30].

Lemma 3.1. *Let* $1\leqslant p<d$. *Then*

$$\dot{H}^1_p \hookrightarrow L^\beta_\theta L^{\infty,\nu}_r \hookrightarrow L^{\infty,\nu}_r L^\beta_\theta, \tag{3.8}$$

where $\beta=\frac{(d-1)p}{d-p}$, $\nu=\frac{d-p}{p}$ *and* $L^{\infty,\nu}_r=\big\{u:\|u\|_{L^{\infty,\nu}_r}=\|r^\nu u(r)\|_{L^\infty_r}<\infty\big\}$.

Applying this lemma with $p=2$ to (3.7), we have

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\frac{|u|^{2^*}}{r}dx \leqslant& \|r^{\frac{d-2}{2}}u\|^{\frac{4}{d-2}}_{L^\infty_r L^\beta_\theta}\int_0^\infty r^{-3}\|u\|^2_{H^1_\theta(S^{d-1})}r^{d-1}dr \\ \leqslant& \|\nabla u\|^{\frac{4}{d-2}}_{L^2}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\Big(\frac{|u|^2}{r^3}+\frac{|u_\theta|^2}{r}\Big)dx.\end{aligned} \tag{3.9}$$

Integrating (3.9) with respect to time t and using (3.4), we deduce that

$$\int_a^b \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{|u|^{2^*}}{r} dxdt \leqslant C(E).$$

This implies the Proposition 3.1.

4 The lower bound on $L_x^{2^*}$ norm

In this section, we will prove a fundamental property $\|u(t)\|_{L_x^{2^*}} \geqslant \eta_1$ for the almost periodic modulus symmetries solution. The analog for the energy critical Schrödinger equation was originally shown by CKSTT [5]. Here we also take the contradiction argument and the induction on energy, but there exist some difficulties. The main difficulty is wave-Hartree equation (1.1) involves two data, the position $u(t_0)$ and the velocity $\dot{u}(t_0)$ which are independent. Hence we cannot get the smallness of $\dot{u}(t_0)$ in any norm, even though under the contradiction hypothesis $\|u(t_0)\|_{L_x^{2^*}} \leqslant \eta_1$. However, we can still get the lower bound on potential energy by exploiting sufficiently the smallness of initial perturbation term.

Firstly, we define the free energy $E_0(u;t)$ by

$$E_0(u;t) = \frac{1}{2}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \Big(|\nabla u(t)|^2 + |\dot{u}(t)|^2\Big) dx. \tag{4.1}$$

By the definition of almost periodic modulus symmetries solution and Remark 1.1, one has:

Lemma 4.1 (Frequency localization of energy at each time)**.** *Let u be the solution as in Theorem 1.3. Then we have small energy at frequencies $\ll N(t)$,*

$$E_0(P_{\leqslant c(\eta_0)N(t)}u;t) \leqslant \eta_0, \tag{4.2}$$

small energy at frequencies $\gg N(t)$,

$$E_0(P_{\geqslant C(\eta_0)N(t)}u;t) \leqslant \eta_0 \tag{4.3}$$

and large energy at frequencies $\sim N(t)$,

$$E_0(P_{c(\eta_0)N(t)<\cdot<C(\eta_0)N(t)}u;t) \sim 1. \tag{4.4}$$

Here $0 < c(\eta_0) \ll 1 \ll C(\eta_0) < \infty$ are quantities depending on η_0.

Frequency localization of energy allows us to limit function on medium frequency. Combining it with stability theory, we can obtain the following essential property for the almost periodic modulus symmetries solution.

Proposition 4.1. *Let u be a minimal energy blow up solution to* (1.1) *on the spacetime slab $I \times \mathbb{R}^d$. Then there exists $\eta_1 : 0 < \eta_1 \ll \eta_0 \ll 1$ (η_0 is as in Lemma 4.1) such that for all $t \in I$, we have*

$$\|u(t)\|_{L_x^{2^*}(\mathbb{R}^d)} \geqslant \eta_1. \tag{4.5}$$

Proof. The argument based on the induction on energy here is adopted as well as [3, 5]. Assume for contradiction that (4.5) failed for some time $t_0 \in I$, so that

$$\|u(t_0)\|_{L_x^{2^*}(\mathbb{R}^d)} < \eta_1. \tag{4.6}$$

Without loss of generality one can translate $t_0 = 0$. By rescaling using (1.3) we may normalize $N(0) = 1$. As stated in the Theorem 2.1: if the free solution $\dot{K}(t)u(0) + K(t)\dot{u}(0)$ had small $X_1(\mathbb{R})$ norm, then the nonlinear solution u had bounded in $X_1(\mathbb{R})$. Hence, we may assume

$$\left\|\dot{K}(t)u(0) + K(t)\dot{u}(0)\right\|_{X_1(\mathbb{R})} \gtrsim 1,$$

that is

$$\left\|\dot{K}(t)u(0) + K(t)\dot{u}(0)\right\|_{L_t^{q_1}(\mathbb{R};L_x^{r_1}(\mathbb{R}^d))} \gtrsim 1, \tag{4.7}$$

where (q_1, r_1) is defined in (2.7).

By the Strichartz estimates and (4.2), (4.3) for $t = 0$, we have

$$\left\|\dot{K}(t)P_{<c(\eta_0)}u(0) + K(t)P_{<c(\eta_0)}\dot{u}(0)\right\|_{X_1(\mathbb{R})} \lesssim \sqrt{\eta_0}, \tag{4.8}$$

$$\left\|\dot{K}(t)P_{>C(\eta_0)}u(0) + K(t)P_{>C(\eta_0)}\dot{u}(0)\right\|_{X_1(\mathbb{R})} \lesssim \sqrt{\eta_0}. \tag{4.9}$$

Let $P_{med} = P_{c(\eta_0)\leqslant\cdot\leqslant C(\eta_0)}$, then

$$\left\|\dot{K}(t)P_{med}u(0) + K(t)P_{med}\dot{u}(0)\right\|_{X_1(\mathbb{R})} \sim 1. \tag{4.10}$$

If we set

$$Lu_{med}(t) = \dot{K}(t)P_{med}u(0) + K(t)P_{med}\dot{u}(0),$$

then

$$\|Lu_{med}(0)\|_{X_1(\mathbb{R})} \sim 1, \text{ i.e. } \|Lu_{med}(0)\|_{L_t^{q_1}(\mathbb{R};L_x^{r_1}(\mathbb{R}^d))} \sim 1. \tag{4.11}$$

On the other hand, from our assumption that $E_{crit} < +\infty$, we obtain that $P_{med}u(0)$ has bounded energy and has Fourier support in the region $c(\eta_0) \lesssim |\xi| \lesssim C(\eta_0)$. Thus by the Strichartz estimates and Bernstein's inequality, we have that

$$\|Lu_{med}(0)\|_{L_t^{\theta q_1}(\mathbb{R};L_x^{\theta r_1}(\mathbb{R}^d))} \lesssim C(\eta_0), \ \theta = \frac{d-1}{d}.$$

This together with (4.11) implies that

$$\|Lu_{med}(0)\|_{L_{t,x}^\infty} \geqslant c(\eta_0).$$

In particular, there exist a time $t_1 \in \mathbb{R}$ and a point $x_1 \in \mathbb{R}^n$ satisfying

$$\left|[\dot{K}(t_1)P_{med}u(0) + K(t_1)P_{med}\dot{u}(0)](x_1)\right| \gtrsim c(\eta_0). \tag{4.12}$$

We may perturb t_1 such that $t_1 \neq 0$. Let δ_{x_1} be the Dirac mass at x_1. Then,

$$\left|\langle u(0), \dot{K}(t_1)P_{med}\delta_{x_1}\rangle + \langle \dot{u}(0), -K(t_1)P_{med}\delta_{x_1}\rangle\right| \gtrsim c(\eta_0). \tag{4.13}$$

Define

$$f(t) := \dot{K}(t_1 - t)P_{med}\delta_{x_1}, \quad g(t) := -K(t_1 - t)P_{med}\delta_{x_1}.$$

One can rewrite (4.13) to obtain that

$$c(\eta_0) \leqslant |\langle u(0), f(0)\rangle + \langle \dot{u}(0), g(0)\rangle|. \tag{4.14}$$

Now we use the induction on energy. Split

$$u(0) = w(0) + \tilde{f}(0), \quad \dot{u}(0) = \dot{w}(0) + \tilde{g}(0)$$

where

$$\tilde{f}(0) = \eta_1 e^{i\theta}(-\Delta)^{-1} f(0), \quad \tilde{g}(0) = \eta_1 e^{i\theta} g(0)$$

for some phase θ to be chosen later. We will show that for an appropriate choice of θ, w has slightly smaller energy than u.

By the definitions of f, g and integration by parts, we have

$$\begin{aligned} E_0(w;0) =& \frac{1}{2}\Big[\big\|\nabla\big(u(0) - \tilde{f}(0)\big)\big\|_2^2 + \big\|\dot{u}(0) - \tilde{g}(0)\big\|_2^2\Big] \\ =& E_0(u;0) - \frac{1}{2}\eta_1 \mathrm{Re}\; e^{i\theta}\big[\langle u(0), f(0)\rangle + \langle \dot{u}(0), g(0)\rangle\big] \\ &+ \frac{1}{2}\|\nabla \tilde{f}(0)\|_2^2 + \frac{1}{2}\|\tilde{g}(0)\|_2^2. \end{aligned} \tag{4.15}$$

Noting that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2}\|\nabla \tilde{f}(0)\|_2^2 &\leqslant \frac{1}{2}\eta_1^2 \int_{c(\eta_0)\leqslant|\xi|\leqslant C(\eta_0)} \frac{1}{|\xi|^2}|\hat{f}(0,\xi)|^2 d\xi \\ &\leqslant \eta_1^2 C(\eta_0), \end{aligned} \tag{4.16}$$

$$\frac{1}{2}\|\tilde{g}(0)\|_2^2 \leqslant \eta_1^2 C(\eta_0) \tag{4.17}$$

and using (4.14), (4.15) and choosing θ appropriately we get

$$E_0(w;0) \leqslant E_{crit} - \eta_1 c(\eta_0) + \eta_1^2 C(\eta_0). \tag{4.18}$$

Next, we estimate the potential energy. First, we claim that

$$\big\|\tilde{f}(0)\big\|_{L_x^{2^*}} \lesssim \eta_1 C(\eta_0). \tag{4.19}$$

To prove the claim, it suffices to show that

$$\big\|h(t_1)\big\|_{L_x^{2^*}} \leqslant C(\eta_0), \tag{4.20}$$

where $h(t) := e^{it\sqrt{-\Delta}}(-\Delta)^{-1}P_{med}\delta_{x_1}$.

In fact, by the Fourier transform, $h(t)$ can be written as

$$h(t,x) \cong \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} e^{i(x\cdot\xi + t|\xi|)} \frac{\varphi_{med}(\xi)}{|\xi|^2} d\xi$$

where φ_{med} denotes the kernel to the operator P_{med}. On the one hand, it is obvious to see that

$$\big\|h(t)\big\|_{L^\infty} \leqslant C(\eta_0). \tag{4.21}$$

On the other hand, the Plancherel theorem and the unitarity of $e^{it\sqrt{-\Delta}}$ give that

$$\|h(t)\|_{L^2_x} \leqslant C(\eta_0). \tag{4.22}$$

Hence the estimate (4.20) is obtained by the interpolation.

So, by the Hardy-Littlewood-Sobolev inequality, the triangle inequality, and the estimates (4.6), (4.19), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{1}{|x-y|^4} |w(0,x)|^2 |w(0,y)|^2 \ dxdy &\leqslant C\big\|w(0)\big\|^4_{L^{2^*}_x} \\ &\leqslant C\big(\big\|u(0)\big\|^4_{L^{2^*}_x} + \big\|\tilde{f}(0)\big\|^4_{L^{2^*}_x}\big) \\ &\leqslant C\eta_1^4 + \eta_1^4 C(\eta_0). \end{aligned} \tag{4.23}$$

Combining (4.18) and (4.23), and noting that $1 \gg \eta_0 \gg \eta_1 > 0$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} E(w(0),\dot{w}(0)) &\leqslant E_{crit} - \eta_1 c(\eta_0) + \eta_1^2 C(\eta_0) + C\eta_1^4 + \eta_1^4 C(\eta_0) \\ &\leqslant E_{crit} - \frac{1}{2}\eta_1 c(\eta_0). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, the definition of E_{crit} implies that there exists a global solution w to (1.1) with initial data $(w(0),\dot{w}(0))$ at time $t=0$ satisfying

$$\big\|w\big\|_{X_1(\mathbb{R})} \lesssim C(\eta_0,\eta_1).$$

Furthermore, by (4.16)and (4.17), we have

$$\begin{aligned} E_0(u-w;0) &= \frac{1}{2}\|\nabla\tilde{f}(0)\|_2^2 + \frac{1}{2}\|\nabla\tilde{g}(0)\|_2^2 \\ &\lesssim \eta_1^2 C(\eta_0). \end{aligned} \tag{4.24}$$

By means of the perturbation Lemma 2.3 with $e=0$, we have

$$\big\|u\big\|_{X_1(\mathbb{R})} \lesssim C(\eta_0,\eta_1).$$

This is a contradiction which ends the proof of Proposition 4.1.

5 The soliton-like solution and frequency cascade solution

In this section, we will use the Morawetz estimate and the lower bound of $L_x^{2^*}$-norm to preclude the soliton-like solution and low-to-high cascade solution in the sense of Theorem 1.3. More precisely, we will prove

Theorem 5.1. *There are no global solutions to* (1.1) *that are soliton-like or low-to-high cascade in the sense of Theorem 1.3.*

Proof. It follows from (1.14) that there exists $\eta_2 : \ 0 < \eta_2 \ll \eta_1^{2^*}$ such that

$$\int_{|x-x(t)|\geqslant \frac{C(\eta_2)}{N(t)}} |u(t,x)|^{2^*} dx \leqslant \eta_2.$$

This together with (4.5) shows that

$$\int_{|x-x(t)|\leqslant \frac{C(\eta_2)}{N(t)}} |u(t,x)|^{2^*} dx \geqslant \eta_1^{2^*} - \eta_2 > 0. \tag{5.1}$$

On the other hand, by the extend causality in Lemma 2.4 and (1.14), we have the following control on the spatial center function $x(t)$

$$|x(t_1) - x(t_2)| \leqslant |t_1 - t_2| + CN(t_1)^{-1} + CN(t_2)^{-1}, \ \forall \ t_1, t_2 \in \mathbb{R}\,.$$

The similar result for wave equation can be found in [15]. Translating space so that $x(0) = 0$, we obtain by the Morawetz estimate (3.1), $N(t) \geqslant 1$ and (5.1), for $T \geqslant 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} C(E) &\geqslant \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{|u(t,x)|^{2^*}}{|x|} dxdt \\ &\geqslant \int_0^T \int_{|x-x(t)|\leqslant \frac{C(\eta_2)}{N(t)}} \frac{|u(t,x)|^{2^*}}{|x|} dxdt \\ &\geqslant \frac{\eta_1^{2^*} - \eta_2}{2} \int_0^T \frac{1}{1+t} dt \geqslant c(\eta_1, \eta_2) \ln{(1+T)}. \end{aligned}$$

Choosing T sufficiently large depending on u, we derive a contradiction.

□

6 The finite time blowup

In this section, we adopt the method of partition timespace norm by time interval in Tao [35] to preclude the finite time blowup solution in the sense of Theorem 1.3. More precisely, we prove

Theorem 6.1. *(Absence of finite-time blowup solutions) There are no finite-time blowup solutions to* (1.1) *in the sense of Theorem 1.3.*

Proof: Without lose of generality, we may assume $\sup I < \infty$, and

$$\|u\|_{X_1(I^+)} = \infty, \ I^+ = I \cap [0, +\infty). \tag{6.1}$$

For each $I_+ \subset\subset I^+$, we may assume that

$$\|u\|_{X_1(I_+)} \geqslant \eta \tag{6.2}$$

for some absolute small constant $\eta > 0$.

This allows us to partition I_+ into consecutive intervals $I_1, \cdots, I_J$ such that

$$\frac{\eta}{2} \leqslant \|u\|_{X_1(I_j)} \leqslant \eta. \tag{6.3}$$

for all $1 \leqslant j \leqslant J$. To prove Theorem 6.1, it suffices to show that the upper bound of J is independent of I_+ . This reduces us to establish a lower bound for $|I_j|$ uniformly for j and I_+.

Now we modify the proof of Lemma 3.5 in [1] to prove a lemma called inverse Sobolev inequality which has been used in [35] for $d = 3$.

Lemma 6.1 (Inverse Sobolev Inequality). *Let $f \in \dot{H}^1_x(\mathbb{R}^d)$ such that $\|f\|_{\dot{H}^1_x(\mathbb{R}^d)} \lesssim 1$ and $\|f\|_{L^{2^*}(\mathbb{R}^d)} \gtrsim \eta$ for some $\eta > 0$. Then there exists a ball $B(x, r)$ in $\mathbb{R}^d$ such that the mass concentration estimate*

$$\int_{B(x,r)} |f(y)|^2 dy \gtrsim_\eta r^2, \tag{6.4}$$

holds. In particular, if there exists $N > 0$ such that $\|P_{\geqslant N} f\|_{L^{2^*}(\mathbb{R}^d)} \gtrsim_\eta 1$, then we can take the radius r to be $O(1/N)$.

Proof. First, we claim that

$$\|f\|_{L^{2^*}(\mathbb{R}^d)} \leqslant C\|\nabla f\|^{\frac{d-2}{d}}_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)} \|f\|^{\frac{2}{d}}_{\dot{B}^0_{2^*,\infty}(\mathbb{R}^d)}. \tag{6.5}$$

Indeed, for any $A(\lambda) > 0$, by Bernstein inequality, we have

$$\|f_{<A(\lambda)}\|_{L^\infty} \leqslant C \sum_{N \in 2^{\mathbb{Z}}, N < A(\lambda)} N^{\frac{d-2}{2}} \|P_N f\|_{L^{2^*}} \leqslant C A(\lambda)^{\frac{d-2}{2}} \|f\|_{\dot{B}^0_{2^*,\infty}}.$$

If we take

$$A(\lambda) = \Big(\frac{\lambda}{2C\|f\|_{\dot{B}^0_{2^*,\infty}}}\Big)^{\frac{2}{d-2}},$$

then

$$\|f_{<A(\lambda)}\|_{L^\infty} \leqslant \frac{\lambda}{2}.$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned} m\{|f|>\lambda\} \leqslant & m\{|f_{\geqslant A(\lambda)}|>\frac{\lambda}{2}\} \\ \leqslant & \frac{4}{\lambda^2}\|f_{\geqslant A(\lambda)}\|_{L^2}^2 \\ \leqslant & \frac{4}{\lambda^2}\int_{|\xi|\geqslant A(\lambda)}|\hat{f}(\xi)|^2 d\xi, \end{aligned} \tag{6.6}$$

where m is the Lebesgue measure on $\mathbb{R}^d$. And so, by layer cake representation theorem in [17], we obtain by (6.6)

$$\begin{aligned} \|f\|_{L^{2^*}}^{2^*} = & 2^*\int_0^\infty \lambda^{2^*-1} m\{|f|>\lambda\} d\lambda \\ \leqslant & C\int_0^\infty \lambda^{2^*-3}\int_{|\xi|\geqslant A(\lambda)}|\hat{f}(\xi)|^2 d\xi d\lambda \\ \leqslant & C\|f\|_{\dot{B}^0_{2^*,\infty}}^{\frac{4}{d-2}}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}|\xi|^2|\hat{f}(\xi)|^2 d\xi, \end{aligned}$$

by using Fubini's theorem. This concludes the claim.

By $\|f\|_{L^{2^*}(\mathbb{R}^d)} \gtrsim \eta$, $\|f\|_{\dot{H}^1_x(\mathbb{R}^d)} \lesssim 1$ and claim (6.5), there exists $N \in 2^{\mathbb{Z}}$ such that

$$\|P_N f\|_{L^{2^*}} \geqslant C\eta^{\frac{d}{2}}.$$

By interpolation and Sobolev imbedding, we have

$$C\eta^{\frac{d}{2}} \leqslant \|P_N f\|_{L^{2^*}} \leqslant \|P_N f\|_{L^2}^{\frac{d-2}{d}}\|P_N f\|_{L^\infty}^{\frac{2}{d}} \leqslant \|f\|_{\dot{H}^1}^{\frac{d-2}{d}} N^{-\frac{d-2}{d}}\|P_N f\|_{L^\infty}^{\frac{2}{d}},$$

which implies

$$\|P_N f\|_{L^\infty} \gtrsim \eta^{\frac{d^2}{4}} N^{\frac{d-2}{2}}.$$

Now let us introduce a bump function ϕ supported on $B(0,1)$ whose Fourier transform has magnitude ~ 1 on the ball $B(0,100)$, and write $\psi_N(x) := N^d(\Delta\phi)(Nx)$. It shows that $P_N f = \tilde{P}_N(f * \psi_N)$, where $\tilde{P}_N$ is a Fourier multiplier similar to P_N, and in particular is bounded on L^∞. We conclude that there exists an x such that

$$|f*\psi_N(x)| \gtrsim \eta^{\frac{d^2}{4}} N^{\frac{d-2}{2}},$$

or in other words

$$\Big|\int_{B(x,1/N)} f(y)(\Delta\phi)(N(x-y))dy\Big| \gtrsim \eta^{\frac{d^2}{4}} N^{-\frac{d+2}{2}}.$$

Therefore (6.4) (with $r=\frac{1}{N}$) follows from Hölder's inequality. □

From this lemma, we can obtain the following key mass concentration estimate.

Lemma 6.2. *Let I' be a subinterval of I_+ such that*

$$\frac{\eta}{2} \leqslant \|u\|_{X_1(I')} \leqslant \eta \tag{6.7}$$

for some $\eta > 0$. Then there exists $t \in I'$ and a ball $B(x,r)$ with $r = O_\eta(|I'|)$ such that the mass concentration estimate

$$\int_{B(x,r)} |u(y)|^2 dy \gtrsim_\eta r^2, \tag{6.8}$$

holds.

Proof. Let N be a frequency to be chosen later. We observe from the Hölder inequality in time and the Bernstein inequality in space,

$$\|P_{<N}u\|_{X_1(I')} \lesssim (|I'|N)^{\frac{1}{q_0}} \|u\|_{L_t^\infty L_x^{2^*}(I' \times \mathbb{R}^d)} \lesssim (|I'|N)^{\frac{1}{q_0}}. \tag{6.9}$$

Thus we can choose

$$N \sim \eta^{q_0} |I'|^{-1}$$

such that

$$\eta \lesssim \|P_{\geqslant N}u\|_{X_1(I')}, \tag{6.10}$$

by the triangle inequality and (6.7).

It follows from the interpolation inequality that

$$\begin{aligned} \eta &\lesssim \|P_{\geqslant N}u\|_{X_1(I')} \\ &\lesssim \|P_{\geqslant N}u\|_{X_0(I')} \\ &\lesssim \|P_{\geqslant N}u\|^{\theta}_{L^\infty(I';\dot{B}^0_{2^*,\infty})} \|P_{\geqslant N}u\|^{1-\theta}_{X_3(I')}, \quad \theta = \frac{d-3}{2d-3}. \end{aligned} \tag{6.11}$$

By the Strichartz estimate, one has

$$\|u\|_{X_0(I')} \lesssim E + \|u\|_{X_0(I')} \|u\|^2_{X_1(I')}. \tag{6.12}$$

This yields that $\|u\|_{X_0(I')} \lesssim E$, since $\|u\|_{X_1(I')} \leqslant \eta$ for small $\eta > 0$.

By the Strichartz estimate again, we also have

$$\|P_{\geqslant N}u\|_{X_3(I')} \lesssim E + \|u\|^3_{X_0(I')} \lesssim C(E). \tag{6.13}$$

Combining (6.11) with (6.13), we have

$$\|P_{\geqslant N}u\|_{L_t^\infty(I';\dot{B}^0_{2^*,\infty})} \gtrsim \eta. \tag{6.14}$$

From the embedding properties of Besov and Triebel spaces, we see that

$$\|P_{\geqslant N}u\|_{L_t^\infty(I';L_x^{2^*})} \gtrsim \|P_{\geqslant N}u\|_{L_t^\infty(I';F^0_{2^*,\infty})} \gtrsim \|P_{\geqslant N}u\|_{L_t^\infty(I';B^0_{2^*,\infty})} \gtrsim \|P_{\geqslant N}u\|_{L_t^\infty(I';\dot{B}^0_{2^*,\infty})} \gtrsim \eta.$$

Thus we complete the proof by using the inverse Sobolev inequality Lemma 6.1. □

Now we utilize the above lemma to establish a lower bound for $|I_j|$ uniformly for j and I_+. From Lemma 6.2 we see that for each $1 \leqslant j \leqslant J$ there exists a time $t_j \in I_j$ and a ball $B(x_j, r_j)$ with $r_j \lesssim |I_j|$ such that

$$\int_{B(x_j,r_j)} |u(t_j,y)|^2 dy \geqslant c r_j^2 \tag{6.15}$$

for some small constant $c > 0$ only depending on E, η.

For the solution $u \in C(I_+,\ \dot{H}_x^1)$, the quantity $r^{-2}\int_{B(x,r)} |u(t,y)|^2 dy$ converges to 0 as $r \to 0$ uniformly for $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $t \in I_+$. Indeed, first, we may extend $u \in C_c(\tilde{I},\ \dot{H}_x^1)$ $(I_+ \subset \tilde{I})$. And by the density: $\mathcal{D}(\tilde{I},\ \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^d)) \hookrightarrow\hookrightarrow C_c(\tilde{I},\ \dot{H}_x^1)$, then for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $f \in \mathcal{D}(\tilde{I},\ \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^d))$ such that

$$\|f - u\|_{L_t^\infty \dot{H}_x^1} < \frac{\varepsilon}{2}. \tag{6.16}$$

On the other hand, by Hardy's inequality, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} r^{-2}\int_{B(x,r)} |u(t,y)|^2 dy \leqslant & 2r^{-2}\int_{B(x,r)} |f|^2 dy + 2r^{-2}\int_{B(x,r)} |f-u|^2 dy \\ \leqslant & 2r^{-2}\int_{B(x,r)} |f|^2 dy + C\|f-u\|_{\dot{H}^1}^2 \\ < & \varepsilon, \end{aligned}$$

provided that we choose $r = r(\varepsilon)$ small. Hence we prove the claim.

Thus we may find a minimal radius $r_0 > 0$ for which there exists a time $t_0 \in I_+$ and a ball $B(x_0, r_0)$ with

$$\int_{B(x_0,r_0)} |u(t_0,y)|^2 dy = c r_0^2. \tag{6.17}$$

From the above discussion we see that r_0 exists and obeys the bound

$$r_0 \lesssim \min_{1 \leqslant j \leqslant J} |I_j|. \tag{6.18}$$

Finally, the estimates (6.3) and (6.18) show that

$$\|u\|_{X_1([0,t_+])} \leqslant C(E) \tag{6.19}$$

holds uniformly for all $0 < t_+ < \sup I$. Therefore, we obtain that

$$\|u\|_{X_1(I^+)} \leqslant C(E), \tag{6.20}$$

which contradicts with (6.1). And so we complete the proof of Theorem 6.1.

Acknowledgements The authors would like to thank Professor Terence Tao his comments which helped improve the paper greatly. TThe authors were supported by the NSF of China under grant No.11171033, 11231006.

References

[1] H. Bahouri, P. Gérard, High frequency approximation of solutions to critical nonlinear wave equations, Amer. J. Math., 121(1999), 131-175.

[2] J. Bergh and J. Löfström, Interpolation spaces, An introduciton. Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften, Springer-Verlag, Berlin-New York, 1976.

[3] J. Bourgain, Global well-posedness of defocusing 3D critical NLS in the radial case. J. Amer. Math. Soc., 12(1999), 145-171.

[4] A. Bulut, M. Czubak, D. Li, N. Pavlovic and X. Zhang, Stability and unconditional uniqueness of solutions for energy critical wave equation in high dimensions. arXiv: 0911.4534v2.

[5] J. Colliander, M. Keel, G. Staffilani, H. Takaoka, and T. Tao, Global well-posedness and scattering for the energy-critical nonlinear Schrödinger equation in $\mathbb{R}^3$. Annals of Math., 167 (2008), 767-865.

[6] J. Ginibre and G. Velo, Generalized Strichartz inequalities for the wave equation, J. Funct. Anal., 133(1995), 50-68.

[7] J. Ginibre and G. Velo, Scattering theory in the energy space for a class of Hartree equations, Nonlinear wave equations (Providence, RI, 1998), 29-60, Contemp. Math., 263, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2000.

[8] M. Grillakis, Regularity and asymptotic behaviour of the wave equation with a critical nonlinearity, Ann. of Math., 132(1990), 485-509.

[9] L. Kapitanski, Global and unique weak solution of nonlinear wave equations, Math. Res. Lett., 1(1994), 211-223.

[10] C. Kenig and F. Merle, Global well-posedness, scattering, and blow-up for the energy-critical focusing nonlinear Schrödinger equation in the radial case, Invent. Math., 166 (2006), 645-675.

[11] C. Kenig and F. Merle, Global well-posedness, scattering and blow-up for the energy critical focusing non-linear wave equation, Acta Math., 201 (2008), 147-212.

[12] C. Kenig and F. Merle, Nondispersive radial solutions to energy supercritical nonlinear wave equations, with applications. Amer. J. Math., 133(2011), 1029-1065.

[13] S. Keraani, On the blow-up phenomenon of the critical nonlinear Schrödinger equation. J. Funct. Anal., 235 (2006), 171-192.

[14] R. Killip and M. Visan, The focusing energy-critical nonlinear Schrödinger equation in dimensions five and higher. Amer. J. Math., 132 (2010), 361-424.

[15] R. Killip and M. Visan, The defocusing energy-supercritical nonlinear wave equation in three space dimensions, Tran. AMS., 363 (2011), 3893-3934.

[16] D. Li, C. Miao and X. Zhang, The focusing energy-critical Hartree equation. J. Diff. Equt., 246(2009), 1139-1163.

[17] E. H. Lieb and M. Loss, Analysis. AMS Graduate Studies in Mathematics, Vol. 14 (1987, second edition 2001).

[18] H. Lindblad and C. Sogge, On existence and scattering with minimal regularity for semilinear wave equations, J. Funct. Anal., 130 (1995), 357-426.

[19] G. P. Menzala and W. A. Strauss, On a wave equation with a cubic convolution, J. Differential Equations, 43(1982), 93-105.

[20] C. Miao, The Modern Method of Nonlinear Wave Equations, Monographs on Modern Pure Mathematics, No.133. Science Press, Beijing, 2010.4.

[21] C. Miao, G. Xu and L. Zhao, Global well-posedness and scattering for the energy-critical, defousing Hartree equation for radial data, J. Funct. Anal., 253(2007), 605-627.

[22] C. Miao, G. Xu and L. Zhao, Global well-posedness and scattering for the defocusing $H^{\frac{1}{2}}$-subcritical Hartree equation in $\mathbb{R}^d$, Ann. I. H. Poincar - AN., 26(2009), 1831-1852.

[23] C. Miao, G. Xu and L. Zhao, Global well-posedness and scattering for the mass-critical Hartree equation with radial data, Journal de Mathématiques Pures et Appliquées, 91(2009), 49-79.

[24] C. Miao, G. Xu and L. Zhao, Global well-posedness, scattering and blou-up for the energy-critical, focusing Hartree equation in the radial case, Colloquium Mathematicum, 114(2009), 214-236.

[25] C. Miao, G. Xu and L. Zhao, Global well-posedness and scattering for the energy-critical, defocusing Hartree equation in $\mathbb{R}^{1+n}$, Communications in Partial Differential Equations, 36(2011), 729-776.

[26] C. Miao, J. Zheng, Energy Scattering for a Klein-Gordon Equation with a Cubic Convolution, arXiv:math/0612028v3.

[27] K. Mochizuki, On small data scattering with cubic convolution nonlinearity, J. Math. Soc. Japan, 41(1989), 143-160.

[28] K. Nakanishi, Scattering theory for nonlinear Klein-Gordon equation with Sobolev critical power, Internat. Math. Res. Notices (1999), 31-60.

[29] K. Nakanishi, Energy scattering for Hartree equations, Math. Res. Lett., 6(1999), 107-118.

[30] K. Nakanishi, Unique global existence and asymptotic behaviour of solutions for wave equations with non-coercive critical nonlinearity, Communications in Partial Differential Equations, 24 (1999), 185-221.

[31] H. Pecher, Low energy scattering for nonlinear Klein-Gordon equations, J. Funct. Anal., 63(1985), 101-122.

[32] J. Shatah, M. Struwe, Well posedness in the energy space for semilinear wave equation with critical growth, Inter. Math. Researth Notice, (1994), 303-309.

[33] W. A. Strauss, Nonlinear scattering theory at low energy, J. Funct. Anal., 41(1981), 110-133.

[34] W. A. Strauss, Nonlinear scattering theory at low energy sequel, J. Funct. Anal., 43(1981), 281-293.

[35] T. Tao, Spacetime bounds for the energy-critical nonlinear wave equation in three spatial dimensions, Dynamics of PDE, 3 (2006), 93-110.